## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE NASHVILLE DIVISION

| DEBBIE DOWELL,                      | ) |                   |
|-------------------------------------|---|-------------------|
|                                     | ) |                   |
| Plaintiff,                          | ) |                   |
|                                     | ) | NO. 3:19-cv-00105 |
| v.                                  | ) | JUDGE RICHARDSON  |
|                                     | ) |                   |
| DAVID BERNHARDT, Acting Director,   | ) |                   |
| Department of the Interior, et al., | ) |                   |
|                                     | ) |                   |
| Defendants.                         | ) |                   |

## **ORDER**

On December 7, 2020, the Court ordered Plaintiff to file, by December 21, 2020, either an Amended Complaint or an appropriate motion or joint stipulation under Rule 41(a)(1)(A)(ii) to dismiss her claims. (Doc. No. 106). Instead, Plaintiff has filed a Motion for Judgment as a Matter of Law (Doc. No. 107, "Plaintiff's Motion"), asking for judgment in her favor.

Plaintiff's Motion repeats all her prior complaints about this case. These matters have been dealt with in prior Court orders, many of which were ruled upon twice (based upon Plaintiffs' motions for review and motions to reconsider). Plaintiff obviously disagrees with just about everything this Court has ruled in this case and does not want to litigate her claims through the normal processes of litigation, including discovery and trial. For example, she specifically stated: "Plaintiff will not participate in discovery, two years after discovery was to take place, nor participate in a trial." (Doc. No. 105). She believes she is entitled to judgment as a matter of law based on the alleged evidence and myriad motions she has filed. Plaintiff also seems to believe that every ruling of this Court, whether by the undersigned or by the Magistrate Judge, is based upon some alleged incompetence of the Court and/or specific animus toward her.

Plaintiff has failed to obey the Court's Order (Doc. No. 106). In that Order, the Court specifically warned Plaintiff that she "must file one or the other of these documents, or else the Court may dismiss this action, pursuant to Rule 41(b), for failure to prosecute." (*Id.* at 3). Accordingly, this action is **DISMISSED with prejudice**, pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b), for Plaintiff's failure to prosecute and failure to obey the Court's Order.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

ELI RICHARDSON

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE